

PEARSON, J.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

MICHAEL OKO,	)	CASE NO. 1:11CV00387
	)	
Petitioner,	)	JUDGE BENITA Y. PEARSON
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
RICHARD GANSHEIMER,	)	<b>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION AND</b>
	)	<b>ORDER</b> (Resolving ECF Nos. 7, 11, 13)
Respondent.	)	

Before the Court is the Report of Magistrate Judge Greg White recommending that the Court: (1) Grant Respondent Richard Ganshiemer's Motion to Dismiss Petitioner Michael Oko's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus ([ECF No. 7](#)); (2) Deny Petitioner Oko's Motion to Furnish Transcript ([ECF No. 11](#)); and, (3) Deny Petitioner Oko's Motion for Leave to Amend Instant Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus ([ECF No. 13](#)).

The Federal Magistrate Act requires a district court to conduct a *de novo* review only of those portions of a Report and Recommendation to which the parties have made an objection. [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)\(C\)](#). Parties must file any objections to a Report and Recommendation within fourteen days of service. [\*Id.\*](#); [\*Fed. R. Civ. P. 72\(b\)\(2\)\*](#). Failure to object within this time waives a party's right to appeal the district court's judgment. [\*Thomas v. Arn\*, 474 U.S. 140, 145 \(1985\)](#); [\*U.S. v. Walters\*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 \(6th Cir. 1981\)](#). Absent objection, a district court may adopt a magistrate judge's report without review. See [\*Thomas\*, 474 U.S. at 149](#). In this instant matter, Petitioner Oko has not filed objections to the Report and Recommendation, despite his extension of time to do so ([ECF No. 16](#)).

(1:11CV00387)

The Court finds that the Report and Recommendation is supported by the record and agrees with the recommendation to dismiss Petitioner Oko's Petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d) (ECF No. 7) and to deny the Motion to Furnish Transcript (ECF No. 11) and Motion for Leave to Amend Instanter Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (ECF No. 13). Any further review by this Court would be a duplicative and an inefficient use of the Court's limited resources.

Thomas v. Arn, 728 F.2d 813 (6th Cir. 1984); Howard v. Sec'y of Health and Human Servs., 932 F.2d 505 (6th Cir. 1991); U.S. v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981). The Court also finds that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

Accordingly, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 15). Petitioner Michael Oko's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (ECF No. 1) is dismissed, and an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

March 2, 2012

Date

/s/ Benita Y. Pearson

Benita Y. Pearson  
United States District Judge